



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
*ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District*  
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov  
410-313-2350  
FAX 410-313-1655  
TDD 410-313-2323

## September Minutes

The eighth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, September 4, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Sam Crozier

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Lisa Badart opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the August 7, 2014 minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

1. 14-30c – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861
2. 14-61 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
3. 14-62 – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 14-63 – 8210-8212 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-64 – 8004 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-65 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-66 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City
8. 14-67 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. 14-60 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-572
10. 14-68 – 2166 Waterloo Road, Ellicott City, HO-889
11. 14-69 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
12. 14-70 – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866
13. 14-71 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City
14. 14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **14-30c – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861**

Final tax credit claim.

Applicant: Donald Startzell

**Background & Scope of Work:** On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to clean and stain the exterior of the cedar house, and fill in holes as needed. The application states that \$5,035.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$1,258.75 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** There is a \$100 difference between the proposal and cancelled checks (which are the higher amount) paid to the contactor. The owner explained that the extra \$100 went toward additional caulking.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the tax credit as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-61 –3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Don Reuwer

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to 1926. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building Benjamin Moore Gunsmith Gray, the trim Prentis Cream and the doors will be Mopboard Black. The window sills on the building will be painted black. The window frames and cornice will be Prentis Cream. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Only three colors will be used and they are all neutral colors.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-62 –8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: William and Brenda Franz

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the first, second floor and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor mansard roof Benjamin Moore Lampblack (CW-695), a gray color. The shutters will be painted Carter Plum (CW-355) and the windows and soffits and cornice will be Franklin White (CW-200).

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The building will only be three colors and the plum will be used as an

accent color.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **14-63 – 8210-8212 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Charles Alexander

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows, doors and top cornice. The windows and cornice will remain white, the front door at 8210 (Pure Wine Café) will remain red. The beadboard door will be changed to gray. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Staff had asked the Applicant if he was interested in painting the white beadboard door gray, as the current white strongly stands out against the granite building. Since the door is not functional, the intent is for it to blend in with the building. Otherwise, the painting of the red and white is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.N (page 50) defines as, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-64 – 8004-8014 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior repairs. Tax Credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.  
Applicant: Mike Pascale

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to approximately 1930. The Applicant proposes to repaint the window frames and door frames white to match the existing. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work and Façade Improvement funds.

**Staff Comments:** The application is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.N (page 50) defines as, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds and receipt of two bids. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-65 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.  
Applicant: Miriam C. Eades

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the siding Benjamin Moore Jicama, a pale yellow/beige, the doors Red Burgundy and the shutters will remain black. The window trim will remain white. The building is currently red with black shutters and a black door.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The yellow is very subtle and not bright. The red will be the brightest color and will only be used on the door.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-66 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Rob Brennan

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the front elevation siding Benjamin Moore Sandy Hook Gray (HC-108), the shutters Branchport Brown (HC-72) and the doors Georgian Green (HC-115). The trim will be white to match the existing.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed colors are all very neutral. The building currently has a dark teal/green façade and the proposed Sandy Hook Gray color is a darker green taupe, which will make the front and side of the building more compatible.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-67 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Dave Carney

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1938-1939. The Applicant proposes to paint the trim on the first floor of the building Benjamin Moore Jojoba, a muted green (AF-460) and the doors Chambourd, a deep purple (AF-645). The ceiling in the recessed entryway would also be painted the green Jojoba.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The green trim color is a muted olive green. The purple will only be used on the doors.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-69 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Ronald Peters

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1850. The Applicant was approved in July 2014 to paint the building, using new colors. The Applicant now seeks approval to caulk and re-glaze the windows as needed. The windows will remain white. The Applicant will also repair a leak on the roof on the right side of the building. The contractor will roll a leak stopping product on the area and check the caulking. The Applicant has explained:

“There is a ledge at the fifth floor level that comes out about 16 inches from the building. The cornice molding is what supports the ledge. The ledge is covered with a rubber roof coating and acts as the rain gutters for the building. There seems to be a slit in one section of the rubber membrane. When it rains hard, the water in this area runs down behind the cornice molding and enters into the wall below and sometimes seeps into the building; its worse when we have snow build up and heavy rains.”

**Staff Comments:** Chapter 6.H (page 42) considers the re-glazing of the windows to be routine maintenance, which is defined as “Repairing windows, including replacement or clear glass and putty.” The repair of the roof leak is also considered routine maintenance, which Chapter 6.E (page 32) defines as repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape, color and texture.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**14-60 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-572**

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building a beige color called Sherwin William Dhurrie Beige (SW-7524). The building is currently brown. The red section of the building where La Palapa is located will be painted black. The awning at LaPalapa will be painted black. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed beige will make the building brighter and the black will coordinate with the awnings and LaPalapa sign. The painting of the awning is not eligible for tax credits as it is not a historic element on the building. Staff has inquired what the material of the awning is, in order to determine if it is a paintable surface.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon the awning being a paintable surface. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work excluding the painting of the awning.

**Testimony:** Ms. Badart swore in Megan Reuwer. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer stated the awning material has been researched and it is a rubberized canvas, which is a paintable material. Ms. Badart confirmed that the item was not eligible for tax credits. Ms. Reuwer stated correct and explained that approval was being sought to paint the awning black with no tax credit and to have tax credit approval for the painting of the building. The Commission had no other comments.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted, but with no tax credits for painting the awning. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **14-68 – 2166 Waterloo Road, Ellicott City, HO-889**

Advisory Comments for subdivision.

Applicant: R. Jacob Hikmat

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1938-1939. The historic house is listed on the Inventory as HO-889, the Lotz House. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 1.8 acre parcel into three lots and retain the historic house on Lot 3. New lots 1 and 2 will be located behind the historic house and accessed from Horseshoe Road, not Waterloo Road.

**Staff Comments:** The streetscape from Waterloo Road will remain unchanged, except for the removal of a forested area behind the historic house, for the construction of the new houses. There are a row of mature cedar trees (about 9) lining the proposed driveway to the two new lots. Staff recommends the cedar trees be retained as they are large and will help buffer the new construction. The subdivision will be located behind the historic house, separated by the forested area. Staff recommends the forested area be retained as much as possible, or the setting for the historic homes along Montgomery Road will be disturbed if the new construction becomes visible.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the cedar trees along the proposed driveway be protected and retained. Staff recommends the maximum amount of forest area be retained around the new construction.

**Testimony:** Ms. Badart swore in Jacob Hikmat. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Hikmat stated he is in agreement with the Staff recommendations and has nothing to add. Mr. Hauser clarified with Mr. Hikmat that the cedar trees will be saved. Mr. Hikmat stated that the trees are on the neighboring property, but control can be kept over them so the trees can be maintained. Mr. Hauser asked about the forested area. Mr. Hikmat stated the forested area will be maintained but the area will not be an easement. He said there will be as little

disturbance as possible when creating lots for the homes. Ms. Tennor asked about the line indicating where trees are to be cleared and asked if it was a reliable representation of the tree line around the new homes. Mr. Hikmat stated the line is 80% accurate and should most likely stay as projected, unless it needs to be moved slightly later in the project. The Commission had no other comments.

**14-70 – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866**

Tax credit pre-approval for structural repairs, exterior alterations/repairs.

Applicant: Kristin Magruder

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1910. The Applicant proposes to repair several structural issues, which includes removing and reconstructing the porch, and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

The application explains:

“The contractor will structurally reinforce the house by reconstructing the sill beam at the front of the house. The sill beam is currently rotted due to age and water damage from improper flashing of the front porch. To remedy this issue, a contractor will remove portions of the front porch and replace and/or fill the sill beam with epoxy to restore structural stability. The front porch will be flashed and reconstructed to original condition.

Due to the sill beam damage, the floor joists now need to be reinforced, as they are no longer properly supported. Contractor will support the floor joists with approximately 18 metal support poles in the basement.

When entering the back portion of the basement, the doorway is being supported with 2x4 pieces of wood, which is insufficient support and causing the wood and floor joists to bow. Contractor will add a steel arch in the doorway to provide adequate support.”

The porch floor contains bluestone tiles, which will be replaced with bluestone tiles that exactly match or the original ones will be reset, depending on whether or not an exact match can be found.

The Applicant also proposes to paint the exterior of the house in the future, although the color has not yet been determined.

**Staff Comments:** The work as explained appears structural in nature and does not include any interior finishing work. The application is eligible for tax credits as defined in Section 20.112 of the County Code, “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing” and “maintenance of the exterior of the structure, including routine maintenance as defined in Section 16.601 of the County Code.”

The application is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The work is mostly structural repairs and the porch will be added back on when the structural repairs are complete.

Staff requests the Commission authorize Staff approval for the paint colors, when the Applicant has finalized a color choice.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval as submitted.

Ms. Holmes added a visit was made to the house, and the Applicant allowed Staff to go inside and view the basement. A photo of the basement was passed out to the Commission. There were also written



comments from Ken Short regarding the porch, which were given to the Commission and Applicant.

**Testimony:** Ms. Badart swore in Adam Magruder. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Magruder stated there are two items that he would like to add to the application. He explained that the first item is regarding plans for pest treatment in the basement after the reconstruction of the sill beam is completed. He explained that per the pest report, the log joists have evidence of beetles so the entire basement will be treated for bugs. The second item concerns the back portion of the cellar basement where there is only a screen door separating the basement from the exterior bilco doors. They would like to install a proper exterior door, which will replace the screen door, in order to weatherproof the basement and keep moisture out. Ms. Tennor asked if the extermination of the bugs would also be part of the tax credit. Ms. Holmes stated yes, as the beetle damage is to the beams and it becomes a structural issue. Mr. Hauser asked if the sistering on the joists done with kiln-dried wood, and not treated lumber, will be removed by the contractor. Mr. Magruder stated there are two places where the joists are sistered with two by fours. These sisters will be removed and replaced.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Magruder's opinion about the information from Ken Short. Mr. Magruder stated he is not sure about the extent to which the current porch needs to be removed. If the portion is small and can be re-poured with concrete and re-stoned with the bluestone with less effort than having to remove the entire porch, Mr. Magruder would like to have this option kept open. Mr. Magruder would prefer to not have to remove the entire porch and replace it with wood. The contractor needs to be asked about how much of the porch really needs to be removed. Ms. Holmes stated Staff would prefer to not require the Applicant to make a choice one way or the other, but to let Mr. Magruder decide while they see the full extent of the construction needed.

**Motion:** Mr. Shad moved to Approve the application for tax credits as submitted, including the pest control treatment, the storm door replacement and the option to fix the front porch either way. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **14-71 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.  
Applicant: Michel Tersiguel

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building, in-kind to match the existing colors. The siding is currently white with black shutters. There is water damage to some of the wood siding, which will be repaired.

The Applicant also proposes to replace the current blue bullnose canvas awnings with new ones to match the existing and add "Tersiguel's" in white to the face of each awning. Staff has requested a drawing of the awning, showing the proposed text.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Staff Comments:** Painting the building the same colors is considered Routine Maintenance, as defined in Chapter 6.N (page 50), which states Routine Maintenance is "painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint." While this work is routine maintenance and does not require a Certificate of Approval, it does require tax credit pre-approval.

Replacing the canvas on the awning with blue canvas to match the exiting is considered Routine Maintenance, as Chapter 6.L (page 48) states that Routine Maintenance is "replacing awnings with new material that exactly matches the existing material." The addition of the text to the awnings is not

considered Routine Maintenance and does require approval. Chapter 6.L (page 48) recommends, “provide a 10-inch to 12-inch valance on awnings. On commercial buildings, use only the awning’s valance for signage.” The awnings are not eligible for tax credits as they are not historic features of the building. Staff is concerned that having ‘Tersiguel’s’ on each awning is too much text for the size and curve of the awning and recommends it be limited to one awning only.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the painting and siding repair. Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the awning replacement. Staff recommends approval of adding ‘Tersiguel’s’ to one awning only.

**Testimony:** The applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes stated that the Applicant was not able to attend, but emailed Staff and said that they will support the recommendation of Staff. Ms. Tennor stated that placing the name Tersiguel’s on one awning only would be difficult. Mr. Hauser does not feel the name should be on the awnings; it would be difficult to pick one that would look right. Ms. Holmes said Staff was concerned about having the name on the awning before seeing the mock-up, but is no longer concerned as the text is small with a light line weight. The Commission and Staff discussed the awnings and the placement of the name.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations, but to allow the name Tersiguel’s to be placed on all three awnings as long as the name is kept subtle. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Install sign.

Applicant: Angelina Brannigan

**Background & Scope of Work:** The building dates to the mid-1980s and was built after the original building burned in 1984. The Applicant proposes to install a projecting sign from a black powder coated cast aluminum bracket. The sign will read on four lines:

Simply Divine  
Boutique  
of  
Ellicott City

The sign will connect to the bracket with eyehooks and S-hooks. The sign will be routed 1 ½ inch HDU (high density urethane) with v-carved text and border. The sign will be 28 inches high by 36 inches wide for a total of 7.6 square feet. The bracket will be 16 inches high by 40 inches wide.

**Staff Comments:** There is an existing bracket on the building from the previous tenant. The Applicant would like to lower and replace that bracket. The County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk. Staff has no objection to the bracket being lowered, as long as the sign complies with the clearance height.

The drawing provided is in black and white and does not specify where the color will be on the sign. The application indicates the background will be black and that there will be gold metallic and red or silver as accents, but does not specify where. Staff has requested a color rendering of the sign. The drawing also does not indicate if the sign is double-sided. Staff recommends the sign be double-sided, if it is not planned to be. Chapter 11.A recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” Staff requires more information on this item.

The text on the sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point.” The text also complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign.”

The sign will be on modern material, but the high density foam is designed to look like wood. Therefore, Staff finds the application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Chapter 11.B of the Guidelines recommends, “use only one projecting or hanging sign per building.” This will be the only sign on the building. The Guidelines also recommend (page 84), “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The sign will be slightly larger than the recommended size, but the building is also larger than some of the historic buildings so the scale is still appropriate.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval, contingent upon receiving a color drawing of the sign and appropriate use of colors.

**Testimony:** The Applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes had made several attempts to contact the Applicant but with no response. The Commission discussed where the different colors might be on the sign. The Commission cannot tell where any of the color references are supposed to be since nothing is really specified in the application. There is not enough information to work with in order to discuss the case. The Applicant needs to be present to give input.

**Motion:** Ms. Badart moved to continue the case until the October meeting so more information can be obtained. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **Other Business**

Ms. Burgess introduced two observers at the meeting: Drew who will be appointed to replace Lisa Badart, and Brian from Savage who may be a future appointee for the Commission.

Ms. Badart moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

---

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

---

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary